



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,437

08/30/2006

Cedric Calvez

Q92127

6383

23373 7590 10/08/2010  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

KRUER, KEVIN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1787

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/08/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com  
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM  
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/561,437	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CALVEZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KEVIN R. KRUER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1787	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 11, 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 11, 2010 has been entered.

### ***Priority***

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in 6/23/03 on the European Patent Office. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the EP application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 25-28, 30-32, and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spears et al (US 6,455,148) in view of JP01108207 (herein referred to as Harada).

Art Unit: 1787

Spears teaches a laminate comprising a polyethylene core and 2 metallic skin layers adhered thereto (Figure 1 and col 3, lines 20+). The laminate is made by applying the adhesive to the metallic skin layers and then laminating the layers to the polyethylene core (col 5, lines 13+), heated and then pressed to make the laminate. The metal may comprise aluminum (col 5, line 22). The adhesive is extruded into a film and then laminated to the metal sheets (col 6, lines 42+). The laminate may further comprise a rigid foam polyethylene layer (col 3, lines 30+), herein understood to read on the additional layer of claim 44. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to directly extrude the adhesive onto the metal sheet as such a method is commonly used in the art to apply adhesive compositions to metallic sheets.

Spears teaches the adhesive may comprise a graft modified polyethylene composition (col 6, lines 43+) but does not teach the claimed adhesive composition wherein the base polymer is simultaneously grafted with silane and carboxylic acid. However, Harada teaches the simultaneous grafting of silane and carboxylic acid onto a polyolefin composition improves the workability and impact resistance of the composition (abstract). The carboxylic acid graft may comprise maleic anhydride (abstract). According to an on-site translation, the unsaturated silane monomers may comprise the silanes of claim 40. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to simultaneously graft silane and carboxylic acid onto the polyolefin taught in Spears. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve the impact resistance and workability of the composition. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to optimize the amount of

Art Unit: 1787

said grafts in order to obtain the desired degree of crosslinking, impact resistance, and workability.

After said simultaneous grafting, the polyolefin is understood to be crosslinked based upon applicant's disclosure on page 11 of the specification that the polyolefin is crosslinked by grafting said polymer with an organosilane compound.

With regards to claim 26, Spears teaches the laminate may be formed into a composite of various lengths, widths and shapes (col 5, lines 10+). Thus, it would have been obvious to use metallic sheets of different sizes in order to obtain a laminate with the desired shape, length, or width.

With regard to claim 41, Spears does not explicitly teach the use of flame retardants but teaches the adhesive may comprise stabilizing additives (0034). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a flame retardant to the adhesive taught in Spears. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve the flame retardant properties of the composite laminate.

With regards to claims 42 and 43, the gel content is herein understood to be a latent property of the composition rendered obvious by Spears in view of Harada. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to optimize the crosslinking density of the composition rendered obvious by Spears in view of Harada to obtain a high gel content. The motivation for doing so would have been because Harada teaches the functional grafts increase the mechanical properties of the composition.

Art Unit: 1787

With regards to claim 48, the limitation “automotive body part” is herein understood to be a preamble limitation that does not provide additional structure to the claim and does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the laminate taught in Spears in that the laminate of Spears is capable of being used as an automobile panel.

5. Claims 29 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spears et al (US 6,455,148) in view of JP01108207 (herein referred to as Harada), as applied to claims above, and further in view of Botros (US 2004/0116602).

Spears in view of Harada is relied upon as above but does not teach the polyethylene should be blended with an elastomer. However, Botros teaches an adhesive composition comprising 65-95.5wt% (0032) HDPE (0015) base resin and an elastomer in relative amount of 15: to 1:1 (0016). Said ratio is understood to be sufficient specific to read on the elastomer percentages of claims 33-36 and the polyethylene ranges of claims 28 and 29. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the blend taught in Botros in place of the olefin polymer taught in Spears because such blends are taught to be highly useful as base

With regards to claims 37 and 38, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to graft polymerize the entire composition taught in order to improve the adhesion to metallic substrates. Functionalizing the entire composition will result in functionalized styrene elastomers (0021), such as styrene maleic anhydride, claimed in claims 37 and 38.

Art Unit: 1787

6. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spears et al (US 6,455,148) in view of JP01108207 (herein referred to as Harada), as applied to claims above, and further in view of JP 56132709A (herein referred to as Showa).

Spears in view of Harada is relied upon as above but does not teach epoxy resin may be added to the composition. However, Showa teaches water treeing defects are minimized when crosslinked polyethylene is blended with 0.5-15wt% epoxy resin (abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add 0.5-15wt% epoxy to the crosslinked polyethylene taught by Spears in view of Harada in order to minimize water treeing.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed May 11, 2010 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN R. KRUEER whose telephone number is (571)272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571-272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1787

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin R Kruer/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1787